

REMARKS

The specification is here amended to correct a minor informality and improve the form of the application for prosecution.

More particularly, in the third line of existing specification paragraph [0056], "end" is inserted before 67a to conform to the antecedent at line 1 of that paragraph which calls for a nut 56a "formed to have a free end 67a".

The present specification amendment is neither believed nor intended to add new matter, but rather merely to improve the form of the specification.

Attention is directed to Office Action page 3. Noted with appreciation is the indication that Claims 21-34 are allowed, that Claims 12-20 would be allowable if amended to overcome the 35 USC 112, second paragraph (antecedent basis) rejection earlier in the Office Action, that Claim 39 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome such 35 USC 112, second paragraph (antecedent basis) rejection earlier in the Office Action and to include the limitations of its base claim and intervening claims, and that Claims 38, 41-48, 51, 53-56 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of their parent claims.

Accordingly, and referring to the 35 USC 112 rejection at Office Action page 2, Claim 12 is amended herewith to provide the required antecedent basis by reciting that the post has "a threaded portion". Claim 14 is amended to overcome the rejection by amending the last clause thereof to recite that the recess is of greater axial extent than said "axially extending annular portion", the antecedent for which is recited in parent Claim 13 at lines 2 and 3. Similarly, Claim 39 is amended to insert antecedent basis by reciting that said base comprises a substantially "annular flange" and by requiring a central "plateau" surrounded by said substantially annular flange. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 USC 112 are believed overcome.

Allowable subject matter dependent Claims 38, 39, 41 and 42 are made dependent from new independent Claim 57 which is believed allowable for reasons given below. Allowable subject matter Claims 45-48 depend from Claim 38. Allowable subject matter dependent Claim 43 depends from Claim 42. Accordingly, these claims are believed allowable at least with their parent Claim 57 and also in view of their allowability indicated by the Office Action.

Allowable subject matter dependent Claim 51 is rewritten in independent form to incorporate the matter of its parent independent Claim 49. Allowable subject matter Claim 53 is rewritten in independent form to incorporate the matter of its parent independent Claim 49. Allowable subject matter dependent Claims 54, 55 and 56 are made dependent from now independent allowable subject matter Claim 53 above mentioned. Accordingly, Claims 51 and 53-56 are believed now in allowable form.

As to Office Action page 2, the rejection of Claims 35, 36, 37 and 40 as anticipated by Farr '897 is believed made moot by cancellation, without prejudice, of these claims.

As to Office Action page 3, the rejection of Claims 49, 50 and 52 as anticipated by Greulich '624 is noted. The rejection is believed made moot as to Claims 49 and 50 by cancellation, without prejudice, of these claims. Remaining Claim 52 is made dependent from new Claim 57 and is believed allowable therewith.

Attention is directed to new independent Claim 57, from which depend several claims above mentioned and new dependent Claims 58 and 59.

New independent Claim 57 is believed directed to subject matter generally of the type to which prior Claim 49 was directed, and is believed to avoid the applied Greulich reference as follows.

Unlike the present invention, the Greulich table post 6 hinges (pivots about the pin 20) from a vertical use position perpendicular to its base 14 (Figures 30 and 31) to a

horizontal non-use position parallel to its base 14 (Figures 32 and 33). In both its use and non-use positions, the Greulich post 6 remains attached by the pin 20 to its base 14. Further, the Greulich post 6 cannot rotate (about its own length axis) with respect to its base 14 since its pivot pin 20 positively blocks any such rotation.

In contrast, the Claim 57 pedestal system is entirely different in structure and function. More particularly, the Claim 57 base is releasably fixed to the post, the base having a central opening with a radially extending tongue, the post having a radially oppositely extending leg, the post having a fixed position free of said base in which said leg is circumferentially offset from said tongue, said post having a second position fixed to said base in which said post is axially and circumferentially offset from said post first position, and said leg is trapped axially behind said tongue.

Accordingly, new independent Claim 57 clearly avoids anticipation by Greulich.

Farr '897 does not anticipate new independent Claim 57 at least because it fails to suggest the Claim 57 requirement for an annular member sleeved on and axially movable on said post. Further, Farr necessarily fails to suggest the Claim 57 requirement for such annular member having a first axial position relatively distant from said base and leg in a second axial position adjacent said leg and said base. Further, Farr fails to suggest the Claim 57 recitation that the annular member has a second position adjacent, and in post/base disengagement inhibiting relation with, the leg and base.

In contrast to Greulich and Farr, the Claim 57 structure advantageously provides a post (e.g. for supporting a dining table top on the cockpit floor of a boat) which in use is double locked to its base (by (1) the tongue and leg and (2) the annular member, but when use is done (e.g. dining is done) can be removed from its base and stowed distantly and out of the way (e.g. to clear cockpit space needed by the crew for sailing)).

Accordingly, new independent Claim 57 is believed patentably distinguishable from the applied Greulich and Farr references. The remaining references appear to be less pertinent and not to require comment. Accordingly, Claim 57 and the above discussed claims dependent therefrom are believed to be in condition for allowance, as are the remaining claims in the application, for reasons given above:

Accordingly, the application is believed in condition for allowance and notice to the effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald J. Tanis

RJT/ad

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL  
& TANIS, P.C.  
2026 Rambling Road  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1631  
Phone: (269) 381-1156  
Fax: (269) 381-5465

Dale H. Thiel  
David G. Boutell  
Ronald J. Tanis  
Terryence F. Chapman  
Mark L. Maki  
David S. Goldenberg  
Liane L. Churney  
Brian R. Tumm  
Steven R. Thiel  
Sidney B. Williams, Jr.

Reg. No. 24 323  
Reg. No. 25 072  
Reg. No. 22 724  
Reg. No. 32 549  
Reg. No. 36 589  
Reg. No. 31 257  
Reg. No. 40 694  
Reg. No. 36 328  
Reg. No. 53 685  
Reg. No. 24 949

Encl: Postal Card

136.0703